

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1–63 were original in the application. Claims 3, 4, 12, 16, 21, 30, 34, 36, 41, 42, 47, 51, 52, 56 and 63 have been canceled. Claims 48–50, and 53–55 and 57–62 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17–19, 22, 31, 32, 37, 39 and 43–45 have been amended herein. Thus, Claims 1, 2, 5–11, 13–15, 17–20, 22–29, 31–33, 35, 37–40, 43–46, and 48–50 are submitted for examination on the merits.

Amendments to the Specification

The patent number of application no. 09/641,302 at page 1, line 11 has been provided, namely U.S. Patent 6,363,320.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 18 and 31 have been amended in response to the objections.

Rejection Pursuant to 35 USC 112

The Examiner contends that in claim 2, line 2, and in claim 19, line 2, the claimed utilizing data from "not more than three satellites" is not disclosed in the specification. Claims 2 and 19 have been amended.

The Examiner contends that in claim 5, line 2; claim 22, line 2; claim 37, line 2; claim 43, lines 1–2, the claimed utilizing only a "single" satellites is not disclosed in the specification. Claims 5, 37 and 43 have been amended.

The Examiner contends that in claim 14, line 15; claim 32, line 16; claim 39, lines 12-13; claim 45, line 12, the claimed providing a location "including that obtained from another object" is not disclosed in the specification. The Examiner contends that the specification at page 15, lines 10-11, page 16, lines 8-12, page 20, lines 14.20, and page 21, lines 15 - 22 discloses using dead reckoning data to determining the position of the corresponding (the host) object. However, the Examiner contends that the specification does not disclose using data from another object to determine the position of the host object. Claims 14, 32, 39 and 45 have been amended.

The Examiner contends that claim 43, lines 9-10, the claimed "at least one satellite" does not correspond with the claim "single satellite" in lines 1-2 of claim 43. Claim 43 has been amended.

Rejection Pursuant to 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 6 - 7, 17 - 18, 23 - 24, and 35 are rejected as obvious over **Monroe** (US 2003/0067542).

In regard to claim 1, the Examiner contends that **Monroe** discloses an apparatus for communication network in which each object includes: a location circuit (para [0109], [0115]); a means for receiving location information, activating responsive function, storing events, and automatically activates selected functions controlling the first object in response to the location of the second object (para [0086]- 0088]; [0091]; [0095]; [0115]); a communication circuit (para [0109]). The Examiner admits that **Monroe** does not explicitly teach using a processor as a means for receiving, communicating and activating responsive function. The Examiner also contends that **Monroe** teaches that

the first object is capable of performing the claimed function (para [0086] - [0088], [0091], [0095], [0115]). Further, the Examiner contends that implementing a controller for controlling data processing, data analysis and data transmission would have been well known. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use a well known controller for performing the analyzing position data, storing the data, and communicating data since selecting a known processor that is known to be able to perform the function of **Monroe**.

The Examiner stated that claim 1 did not recite communication between objects other than through a network server. This was based on the interpretation by the Examiner of the phrase, "a communication circuit installed in each object coupled to the processor in the same object to transmit and to receive messages within the network" to necessarily include a server. While communication between objects through a server may be possible, the claim as amended explicitly extends to direct communication between objects and is distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth in the remarks made in the prior amendment.

Further, whether or not the use of a processor is obvious is not the issue. There is no teaching suggesting *a means in the first object to automatically activate selected functions for controlling the first object in response to the variable location of the second object*.

Monroe is a system whereby the location and orientation of grounded airplanes are communicated to a wireless system which includes, not other aircraft, but various ground support equipment, particularly security vehicles or devices. Taking the first object of the claim to be the aircraft where the position GPS circuits are located, and the

second object to be one of the security vehicles or devices, there is no teaching whatsoever in **Monroe** that a “processor corresponding to the first object (airplane) *automatically activates selected functions* controlling the first object (airplane) in response to the location of the second object (security vehicles or devices)” as called for by claim 1.

This automatic function of the location determining object in response to the location of another object is entirely missing from **Monroe**. A review of the automatic functions of **Monroe** shows that collected information is analyzed and prioritized according to type of event, location and nature of required response for automatically dispatching the proper response from the security devices (Abstract), [0012].

Monroe describes a backup response to be automatically activated if a security device detects an explosion or a gunshot, whereby an alarm condition is activated to alert central security and other personnel in the vicinity [0020].

Automatic tracking of ground transport in the terminal by tracking cameras in conjunction with a recording device provides a record of each ground transport asset in case of a detrimental event, such as fire, terrorist event, theft, or collision [0028]. Note there is no means for automatic collision avoidance disclosed concerning the grounded airplanes for that matter anything else.

Automatic dispatch of security resources is discussed using the sensors to determine the locational origin of an explosion or a gunshot to assist in pursuit of a perpetrator [0104]. The origin is correlated by a computer with the nearest emergency assets, based upon their known positions, and those assets are automatically dispatched. The sensors which have the means for determining position do not

automatically do anything in response to the position of the emergency assets.

The onboard-dual GPS system on the aircraft provides accurate location information and permits the camera to automatically adjust to monitor the entire aircraft within its range [0106]. Nothing is done in the aircraft as a result of the camera position.

Even where security personnel carry GPS and are summoned to a nearby location to attend to a breach in security, there is still no “processor corresponding to the first object (security personnel) {which} automatically activates selected functions controlling the first object (security personnel) in response to the variable location of the second object (breach area) [0112]. **Monroe** does not initiate an act based on variable locational proximity.

In regard to claims 6 and 7, the Examiner contends that **Monroe** teaches storing the location, time, of an object for an event and also teaches storing the type of event (para [0084]; [0082]). The Examiner postulates that storing speed, direction of an object would have been known, as is choosing to store specific information that is of interest to an operator.

Claims 6 and 7 are directed to file histories involving events to which a correlated contingent action is automatically undertaken and is not directed to communication between security resources, their dispatching or their inventorying as in **Monroe** and as distinguished over the cited art in the remarks regarding claims 6 and 7 in the previously filed amendment.

Claims 6 and 7 depend on claim 1 and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the nature of the stored history file in the overall combination of claim 1 is not

suggested by the cited art or well known.

In regard to claim 17, the Examiner contends that implementing a plurality of input/output ports to interface with a plurality of systems would have been known, but does not cite any reference for a combination of a plurality of input/output ports in an object which has location detection circuitry. Pursuant to MPEP 2144.03(C), 37 CFR 1.111b Applicant challenges the assertion that it is known to use a multiple port architecture in a GPS circuit.

Claim 17 depends on claim 1 and is allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of the processor in the combination of claim 1 with a plurality of external devices is not suggested by the cited art or well known. Applicant maintains the argument with respect to claim 17 made in the previous amendment as distinguishing over the art.

In regard to claims 18, 23, 24, and 35 the Examiner refers to the rejection of claims 1 - 3, 6, 7, and 17 described above. The applicant respectfully makes a similar reference to its responses to the same claim rejections.

Claims 2, 19 and 20 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Smith** US Patent 6,239,721.

In regard to claims 2, 19 and 20, the Examiner contends that **Smith** teaches communicating with a well known terrestrial location detection network 31-1 to 31-6 in Fig. 1 to determine the position of the object from a combination of signals from the GPS system and the terrestrial location detection network (col. 5, lines 4-10; col., lines 10-15; col. 4, lines 9-18). The Examiner admits that **Smith** does not explicitly disclose

less than three satellites, however, since **Smith** discloses using the terrestrial data when the number of data received from the satellites is not sufficient (col.5, lines 4-8), and since it would have been well known that the number of data collected from four satellites are sufficient in determining the position of an object, the Examiner contends that **Smith** obviously discloses not more than three satellites as claimed. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to include a well known terrestrial communication network of **Smith** to the system of **Monroe** in order to improve correctness in determining object's position and to ensure obtaining the object's position even if the object is traveling in a tunnel.

Claim 2 as amended is explicitly directed to the use of only one satellite with a ground station and hence is distinguished over the cited art for the grounds set out in the remarks to the previously filed amendment.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and claims 19 and 20 depend on claim 18 and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of claims 2, 19 and 20 with claim 1 or 18 as may be appropriate is not suggested by the cited art or well known.

Claims 5, 22, 37, and 43 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Pratt** US Patent 6,285,315 and further in view of **Smith**.

In regard to claims 5, 22, 37, 43, the Examiner contends that **Pratt** teaches the capability of determining the location of the mobile device using either the data from the GPS receiver or the terrestrial data (col.6, lines 16 - 48) depending on the accuracy required. Further, the Examiner contends that determining location of a mobile object

using terrestrial data only would have been known as taught by **Smith** in col.3, lines 31-34. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use the terrestrial data when the data from the GPS receiver is not available, since using a known alternative method (using terrestrial data) for determining the location of a mobile device when the GPS signal is not available.

The claims have been amended to explicitly recite that the terrestrial location network is an independent location determining network from the GPS system. The applicant reasserts the remarks of the previously filed amendment as distinguishing over the cited art.

The Examiner misreads **Pratt**. **Pratt** does not determine the location of the mobile device using either the data from the GPS receiver or the terrestrial data (col.6, lines 16 - 48). **Pratt** discusses how to overcome the intentional GPS errors inserted into satellite data by transmitting corrected ephemeris data concerning the satellites from a terrestrial station, which itself received its input uncorrected ephemeris data from satellites. All data is ultimately derived from a satellite and there is not terrestrial location detection network involved in **Pratt**.

Claim 5 depends on claim 1, claim 22 depends on claim 18 and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of claims 5 and 22 with claim 1 or 18 as may be appropriate is not suggested by the cited art or well known.

Claims 8 - 11, and 25 - 29 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Fera et al** US Patent 6,338,152 and further in view of **Ono**, US Patent 6,466,950.

In regard to claims 8 - 11, the Examiner contends that **Monroe** teaches storing

events of history files and transmitting the events to other objects (para [0086]; [0123]; [0109]). Moreover, storing sent and received messages and tagging the files to be deleted would have been known as taught by **Fera** in col. 4, lines 39 - 56; col.5, lines 1-10; col. 7, lines 1 - 3; and clearing a data file after transmitting data file to a remote server would have been known as disclosed by **Ono** in col. 7, lines 25-40. The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to include downloading and uploading data file of **Monroe** to a remote server and to delete the file after the transmission in order to facilitate saving data at a remote location when the memory device in the mobile object is limited.

Claim 8 – 11 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1 or 7, and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of claims 8 – 11 with claim 1 or 7 as may be appropriate is not suggested by the cited art or well known.

In regard to claims 25 – 29 the Examiner refers to claims 8 – 11 without further comment. Similarly, the applicant refers to the responses made with respect to claims 8 – 11.

Claims 13 and 31 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Pratt** and further in view of **Rowson et al** US Patent 6,067,484.

In regard to claims 13 and 31 the Examiner contends that **Rowson** teaches selecting a best signal from a plurality of input sources (col. 6. lines 19 – 40), further including modems for wireless communication between devices would have been well known. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to select the data from input sources of **Pratt** in order to ensure using appropriate signal for determining

position of the mobile device of **Monroe**.

Claim 13 calls for two sources of location information and two-way modems as argued in the remarks in the previously filed amendment.

Claims 13 and 31 depend on claim 1 or 18, and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of claims 13 and 31 with claim 1 or 18 as may be appropriate is not suggested by the cited art or well known.

Claims 14 and 32 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Burns et al** US Patent 5,129,605.

In regard to claims 14 and 32, the Examiner contends that **Monroe** teaches two-way radio communication utilizing transceiver (para [0109]) and that **Burns** teaches using the location data from the dead reckoning when the GPS fail to provide valid location fix (col.5, lines 14-17, lines 49-64; col.6, lines 9-20).

Claims 14 and 32 depend on claim 1 or 18, and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of claims 14 and 32 with claim 1 or 18 as may be appropriate is not suggested by the cited art or well known.

Claims 15 and 33 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Burns** and further in view of **Korver et al** US Patent 6,373,403.

In regard to claims 15 and 33, the Examiner contends that using three dimensional gyro 24 (Fig.4) in the dead reckoning system would have been known as disclosed by **Korver**. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to use the gyro of **Korver** in the dead reckoning system of **Burns** for the position

communication system of **Monroe** in order to provide correct location concerning heading, pitch and roll of the vehicle.

Claims 15 and 33 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1 or 18, and are allowable therewith. The applicant maintains the combination of claims 15 and 33 with claim 1 or 18 as may be appropriate is not suggested by the cited art or well known.

Claims 38, 44 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Pratt** and further in view of **Smith** and **Rowson**.

In regard to claims 38 and 44, the Examiner refers to the rejection of claim 13 without further comment. Similarly, the applicant refers to the responses made with respect to claim 13.

Claims 39 and 45 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Pratt** and further in view of **Smith** and **Burns**.


In regard to claims 39 and 45, the Examiner refers to the rejection of claim 14 without further comment. Similarly, the applicant refers to the responses made with respect to claim 14.

Claims 40 and 46 were rejected as being obvious over **Monroe** in view of **Pratt** and further in view of **Smith** , **Burns** and **Korver**.

In regard to claims 40 and 46, the Examiner refers to the rejection of claim 15 without further comment. Similarly, the applicant refers to the responses made with respect to claim 15.

Applicant respectfully requests advancement of the claims to allowance.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 3, 2005 by



Signature Eric Hoover

February 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel L. Dawes, Esq.

Registration No. 27,123

Myers Dawes Andras & Sherman LLP

19900 MacArthur Blvd., 11th Floor

Irvine, CA 92612

(949) 223-9600